



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/814,042	03/20/2001	Kevin E. Crawford	END920000058US1(13761)	3522

7590 06/22/2005  
Richard L. Catania, Esq.  
Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, NY 11530

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/814,042

Applicant(s)

CRAWFORD ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B. PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

20

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the RCE amendment filed on 3/7/2005.

**This action is made Non-Final.**

2. In the amendment, claims 1-17 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, and 11 are independent claims.

3. The rejections of claims 1-2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 14, 16-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Peiffer et al, hereinafter Peiffer (Pat.# 6,834,297 B1, 12/21/2004, filed 10/6/2000) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

### ***Specification***

4. Appropriate corrections have been made to the abstract of the disclosure. Therefore, its objection has been withdrawn.

### ***Drawings***

5. The drawings filed on 3/20/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. Appropriate corrections have been made to claims 1, 6, and 11. Therefore, the 35 USC 112 rejections have been withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3, 7-8, and 12-13 remain, and 1-2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 14, 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peiffer, in view of “Laura Lemay’s Web Workshop JavaScript”, Lemay et al, hereinafter Lemay, Sams.net, 1996, pp.219-229.

Regarding independent claim 1, Peiffer discloses a client browser for downloading of a web page(s)—*web content file* containing web page source data having certain layout-- from a server. The web page contains Javascript applets—*storing information in a scripted language format* (col.1, lines 53-65, col.5, lines 11-33, col.6, lines 16-33).

Moreover, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out non-renderable data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns, etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource (col.2, lines 1-16, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19). The filtering out of the non-renderable data does not alter the layout of the web page. Peiffer fails to explicitly teach *removing pre-identified subject matter in said scripted language*. However, Lemay teaches the use of Javascript functions and comments (using “//” marks) for rotating advertisement banners, which are annoying to some users (page 227, line 10-page 229, line 9,

Art Unit: 2178

list. 12.4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Peiffer, and Lemay and remove the Javascript comments in the web page, because Peiffer teaches above the benefit of stripping off non-renderable or unneeded data from a web page, thereby, thereby reducing the amount of data that has to be transmitted, and speeding up the display of the web page.

Furthermore, Peiffer teaches the sending of the filtered web page—*downloading to the browser the reduced size file* without the filtered objects-- to the requesting web browser client for display (col.1, lines 53-65, col.2, lines 1-16, 33-56, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out non-renderable data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns,--*comments and unused logic blocks* etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource (col.2, lines 1-16, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out non-renderable data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns, etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource (col.2, lines 1-16, 31-56, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19). Peiffer fails to explicitly teach *the unused logic blocks are functions that are in the file but not used*. However, Lemay teaches the use of Javascript functions and comments (using “//” marks) for rotating advertisement banners, which are annoying to some users (page 227, line 10-page 229, line 9, list. 12.4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Peiffer, and

Art Unit: 2178

Lemay, because Peiffer teaches above the benefit of stripping off non-renderable or unneeded data from a web page, thereby, thereby reducing the amount of data that has to be transmitted, and speeding up the display of the web page.

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out non-renderable data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns, —*consolidating into one logic blocks* of markup language representing the HTML lines—by deleting the non-renderable data—*shortening recurring identifiers* --, which are not needed, from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource (col.2, lines 1-16, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19).

Claims 6-9 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 1-4 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 11-14 are directed towards a program storage device for storing the steps found in claims 1-4 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 1, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out non-renderable data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns, etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource (col.2, lines 1-16, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19). The web page is formatted using HTML code—*human readable source code*--.

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 1, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out non-renderable data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns, etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource. The web page is then sent to the browser client (col.2, lines 1-16, 33-56, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19). In other words, the display of the web page takes place at the client, without any recompilation after the size has been reduced at the server.

9. Claims 5, 10, and 15 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peiffer, in view of Ross (Pat.# 6,163,780, 12/19/2000).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 4, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out non-renderable data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns, etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource—*consolidating into one logic blocks* of markup language representing the lines-- by filtering out the non-renderable data, because it does not perform a vital function to the web browser client for fails to explicitly teach *the consolidating step includes the step of identifying duplicated functions and replacing the duplicated functions with a reference to a single function in a library*. However, Ross teaches reducing the size or condensing of JAVA code by replacing each method or function in the code with a reference to the location to that method within a sorted class list—*single function in a library* (col.2, lines 9-11, 29-41, 54-67, col.3, lines 8-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

Art Unit: 2178

combine Peiffer, and Ross, because the benefit of compressing computer code so as to remove unnecessary code and data to shorten access, and execution times (col.1, lines 48-col.2, line 26). This in turn would lessen the load on the limited resources of the small device such as the one.

Claim 10 is directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claim 5, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 15 directed towards a program storage device for storing the steps found in claim 5, and therefore is similarly rejected.

### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are not persuasive. Regarding claims 1, 6, and 11, Applicants indicate that the prior art references do not disclose or suggest that the web content file stores, and remove information in a scripted language (pages 8-9). The Examiner disagrees, because Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out non-renderable data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns, etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource (col.2, lines 1-16, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19). The filtering out of the non-renderable data does not alter the layout of the web page. Peiffer fails to explicitly teach *removing pre-identified subject matter in said scripted language*. However, Lemay teaches the use of Javascript functions and comments (using “//” marks) for rotating advertisement banners, which are



Art Unit: 2178

annoying to some users (page 227, line 10-page 229, line 9, list. 12.4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Peiffer, and Lemay and remove the Javascript comments in the web page, because Peiffer teaches above the benefit of stripping off non-renderable or unneeded data from a web page, thereby, thereby reducing the amount of data that has to be transmitted, and speeding up the display of the web page.

Claims 2-5, 7-10, 16-17 are dependent on independent claims 1, 6, and 11, which have been rejected as indicated above. Therefore, these dependent claims are rejected at least based upon the rejection of their respective independent claims.

### ***Conclusion***

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2178

system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)



**CESAR PAULA**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

6/21/05